

REMARKS

Claims 1-11, 13-23 and 25-27 are all the claims pending in this application. Claims 6 and 18 have been amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejection. Reconsideration and allowance of all the rejected claims are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 6 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Particularly, it is alleged that there is no antecedent for “the operating system” and “the application” recited in each of claims 6 and 18. Claims 6 and 18 have been amended to overcome this rejection.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1-11, 13-23, and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Traversat *et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,052,720). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection on the following basis.

Independent claim 1 recites, among other things, “associating the one or more additional images to the at least one image” and “creating at least one customized image, wherein the at least one customized image comprises the at least one image of the device and the one or more additional images.” At least these features are not taught by Traversat.

A device image is a term of art and refers to information that is related to memory, storage, processors, applications, access privileges, and other similar features that represent the configuration state of a network device and is completed prior to a user login. The image is used to boot the network device based on the device characteristics. In an exemplary embodiment of the invention, a base image may be created and stored in a directory (see page 13, line 20 – page 14, line 1). Additional images may be associated with the base image, and when the base image is placed on the workstation, the additional images may also be placed on the workstation as if there were a single image. The additional images may come from other workstation images or from applications that have been stored in the directory (see page 14,

lines 1-6). One advantage of this exemplary embodiment is that it enables a base image to remain constant while associated images may be updated or additional applications may be applied.

Traversat, by contrast, appears to describe a system for providing a data framework and associated client/server protocol for storing and exchanging data among computers in a network (see Abstract). When a client device connects to a server, the client device apparently sends profile information to the server, and the server attempts to match the profile with a specific profile in its machine namespace (see column 10, lines 57 – 67).

According to Traversat, a user logs onto the workstation and retrieves the user's preferences. For example, in a word processing application, a particular user preference could be a default font and size for documents. Retrieving user preferences occurs after login and enables the user to have their user preferences applied to any machine in the network. Therefore, Traversat does not teach or suggest associating one or more additional images to the at least one image because retrieving user preferences requires post-login information. As such, this user preference information is not an image, which is known in the art to provide information needed to boot a network device and is applied prior to user login.

Because Traversat fails to disclose associating one or more additional images to an original device image, creating a customized image that is placed on the device. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over Traversat. Independent claims 13 and 27 recite features similar to those described above in reference to claim 1. As such, these claims are allowable for at least the reasons described above. Additionally, claims 2-11, 14-23, 25, and 26 depend from and add features to one of the independent claims. As such, these claims are allowable over Traversat at least by virtue of their dependency.

Conclusion

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Dated: October 14, 2005

Respectfully submitted,



Sean L. Ingram

Registration No.: 48,283

CUSTOMER NO. 00909

PILLSBURY WINTHROP SHAW PITTMAN LLP
P.O. Box 10500
McLean, Virginia 22102
703-905-2000